

STATE OF MAINE  
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

Docket No. 2003-647

January 6, 2004

LAUREL KING, ET AL.  
Request for Commission Investigation  
Into to Frequency of Loss of Service  
Against Verizon-Maine

ORDER DISMISSING  
COMPLAINT

WELCH, Chairman; DIAMOND and REISHUS, Commissioners

---

**I. SUMMARY**

In this Order, we dismiss a complaint filed by Verizon customers in Surry, Maine, because Verizon has eliminated the cause of the complaint.

**II. BACKGROUND**

On September 9, 2003, Lead Complainant Laurel King and 14 persons from Fox Lane and Evergreen Lane in Newberry Neck, Surry, filed a complaint (Complaint) with the Commission pursuant to 35-A M.R.S.A. § 1302. The Complaint alleged that Verizon's service had been unreliable, causing frequent loss of service, and noise, static and echo effects on calls.

On September 15, 2003, Verizon filed its Response to Complaint, in which it acknowledged the receipt of frequent trouble reports from its Newberry Neck customers in Surry and indicated a digital loop carrier (DLC) that serves the Newberry Neck area to be at fault, as well as possible signal losses in the cables that connect that DLC system to the Central Office switch in Ellsworth.

**III. DISCUSSION**

Staff issued two sets of data requests to Verizon on September 24, 2003, and a data request to the Complainants on October 1, 2003. Staff directed Verizon to file weekly summaries of troubles reported by customers served off the Newberry Neck DLC system, which Verizon has done.

Subsequently, Verizon reported doing extensive testing on the Newberry Neck DLC system and installing four additional repeaters to boost the signals between the Ellsworth switch and the DLC system. In addition, Verizon reported moving all the lines served by the DLC system onto a new terminal in the Ellsworth switch. That work was completed on October 30, 2003. Since then, the weekly trouble report summaries filed by Verizon have shown no reported troubles. On December 18, 2003, Staff contacted Lead Complainant Laurel King and Complainant William Doak. Mrs. King reported

having no further problems with Verizon's service, as did Mr. Doak. He also reported contacting other Complainants and neighbors and hearing from them that they too have had no further problems with Verizon's service.

#### **IV. DECISION**

Because the Complainants and other customers served off the DLC system in Newberry Neck, Surry, are no longer reporting troubles to Verizon, and because Complainants report that they are no longer having problems with Verizon's service, we conclude the work Verizon has done to improve services to customers served by that DLC system has eliminated the cause of the Complaint. Accordingly, we dismiss the Complaint, as permitted by 35-A M.R.S.A. § 1302(2).

Dated at Augusta, Maine, this 6<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2004.

BY ORDER OF THE COMMISSION

---

Dennis L. Keschl  
Administrative Director

COMMISSIONERS VOTING FOR:      Welch  
   Diamond  
   Reishus

## NOTICE OF RIGHTS TO REVIEW OR APPEAL

5 M.R.S.A. § 9061 requires the Public Utilities Commission to give each party to an adjudicatory proceeding written notice of the party's rights to review or appeal of its decision made at the conclusion of the adjudicatory proceeding. The methods of review or appeal of PUC decisions at the conclusion of an adjudicatory proceeding are as follows:

1. Reconsideration of the Commission's Order may be requested under Section 1004 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (65-407 C.M.R.110) within 20 days of the date of the Order by filing a petition with the Commission stating the grounds upon which reconsideration is sought.
2. Appeal of a final decision of the Commission may be taken to the Law Court by filing, within **21 days** of the date of the Order, a Notice of Appeal with the Administrative Director of the Commission, pursuant to 35-A M.R.S.A. § 1320(1)-(4) and the Maine Rules of Appellate Procedure.
3. Additional court review of constitutional issues or issues involving the justness or reasonableness of rates may be had by the filing of an appeal with the Law Court, pursuant to 35-A M.R.S.A. § 1320(5).

Note: The attachment of this Notice to a document does not indicate the Commission's view that the particular document may be subject to review or appeal. Similarly, the failure of the Commission to attach a copy of this Notice to a document does not indicate the Commission's view that the document is not subject to review or appeal.